

REMARKS

The Office Action of September 12, 2005 was received and reviewed. The Examiner is thanked for the review of this application.

Claims 1-20 and 24-28 are pending for consideration, and claims 21-23 and 29 have been cancelled previously.

Turning now to the detailed Office Action, claims 1 and 3-4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Yu (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0122799 – hereafter Yu). Further, claim 2 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Yu in view of Friend (U.S. Patent No. 6,580,212 – Friend). Still further, claims 5-15 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U Yu in view of the remark. Finally, claims 16-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Yu in view of Kim et al. (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0067266 – hereafter Kim). These rejection are respectfully traversed at least for the reasons provided below.

Initially, Applicants note that claims 24-28 appear to be either not rejected or their rejection is not complete, as evident by an incomplete sentence in the last paragraph of page 6 of the Office Action. Hence, Applicants will not address claims 24-28 specifically.

In the §102(e) rejection of claims 1 and 3-4, the Examiner asserts that Yu discloses a display device comprising a transistor and an electrode electrically connected to the transistor, wherein the electrode comprises a first transparent conductive film comprising indium tin oxide containing one or both of silicon oxide and silicon as the bottom layer, and a second transparent conductive film. However, Applicants respectfully assert that Yu does not teach a transistor and one or both of silicon oxide and silicon contained in indium tin oxide as the bottom layer.

Further, the presently claimed invention relates to an electrode comprising a first transparent film and a second transparent film. That is, the first transparent film and the second transparent film are formed as one electrode. In contrast with Applicants' claimed invention, as shown in Fig. 5 of Yu, the "first" (i.e., lower) transparent film 142 and the "second" (i.e., upper) transparent film 140 are separately provided. The "first" (i.e., lower) transparent film 142 is provided on a lower sheet 120 and the "second" (i.e., upper) transparent film 140 is provided on an upper sheet 124, and a plurality of spacers 128 are provided between the "first" (i.e., lower) transparent film 142 film and the "second" (i.e.,

upper) transparent film 140.

Moreover, paragraphs [0032] of Yu discloses the following:

[0032] An upper electrode layer may be formed at an end of the upper transparent film 140, and a lower electrode layer may be formed at an end of the lower transparent film 142. The upper electrode layer may be short-circuited from the lower electrode layer when the upper sheet 124 is pressed by a stylus pen or a finger, to generate a signal having the current or voltage level variable in accordance with the pressed position. Accordingly, the upper and the lower electrode layer may be formed of a metal material with good conductivity, for example, by printing silver Ag on it.

Yu's invention is a touch sensitive screen, wherein the upper electrode layer may be short-circuited from the lower electrode layer when the upper sheet 124 is pressed, such as by a stylus, etc. On the other hand, Applicants' claimed electrode (e.g., electrode 17) comprises a first transparent conductive film (e.g., film 12 in Fig. 1) and a second transparent conductive film (e.g., film 13 in Fig. 1). As disclosed on page 6, lines 4-24 of the specification, the use of the first and second transparent films in an electrode relate to minimizing residue from the use of etching acid solution in making the electrode, etc. Clearly, the function and structure of the electrode of the presently claimed invention are completely different from those of Yu. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that Yu clearly does not teach, disclose or suggest an electrode comprising a "first" (i.e., lower) transparent film 142 and a "second" (i.e., upper) transparent film 140 as alleged by the Examiner.


Consequently, since each and every feature of the present claims is not taught (and is not inherent) in the teachings of Yu, as is required by MPEP Chapter 2131 in order to establish anticipation, the rejection of claims 1, 3 and 4, under 35 U.S.C. §102(e), as anticipated by Yu is improper.

The arguments set forth above with respect to Yu in the §102(e) rejection are also applicable to the all of the §103(a) rejections in which Yu is applied as the primary reference. That is, as Yu is deficient as noted above, the combination of Yu and Friend, Kim and "the remark" is improper, and a *prima facie* case of obviousness has not been established in the §103(a) rejections.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the rejections of record be

reconsidered and withdrawn by the Examiner, that claims 1-20 and 24-28 be allowed and that the application be passed to issue. If a conference would expedite prosecution of the instant application, the Examiner is hereby invited to telephone the undersigned to arrange such a conference.

Respectfully submitted,



Luan C. Do

Registration No. 38,434

NIXON PEABODY LLP

Suite 900, 401 9th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004-2128
(202) 585-8000